

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-31 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 4, 18 and 19 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

The Examiner has maintained from the previous Office Action the 35 USC §102(b) rejection of claims 5, 6, 7/5, 8/5, 8/6, 9/5, 9/6, 15/5, 15/6, 20, 21, 30/5, 30/6 and 31/21 as anticipated by **Hager et al.**

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted in Applicants' Appeal Brief, **Hager et al.** clearly states that all elements 64, 68 are made of the same material, namely, SORBOTHANE, although elements 68 differ in hardness from each other somewhat.

Furthermore, although **Hager et al.** teaches various types of materials with differing hardnesses (or vibration/shock absorbing characteristics), it should be noted that **Hager et al.** does not teach using such various types of materials simultaneously for the shock/vibration members.

In other words, **Hager et al.** is silent regarding the simultaneous use of mutually different materials for the vibration and/or shock absorbing member provided at one location and the vibration and/or shock absorbing member provided at another location within the electronic apparatus.

Hager et al. also does not teach that the vibration and/or shock absorbing member provided between the disk unit and the inner side surface is made of a material having a higher

vibration absorbing characteristic than a material forming the vibration and/or shock absorbing member provided between the disk unit and the inner bottom surface, and the vibration and/or shock absorbing member provided between the disk unit and the inner bottom surface has a higher shock absorbing characteristic than the material forming the vibration and/or shock absorbing member provided between the disk unit and the inner side surface, as recited in claims 30 and 31 of the present invention.

It should be noted that there are vibration/shock absorbing characteristics other than mere hardness. For instance, different materials may have the same hardness at a specific temperature, but have different temperature/hardness characteristics (at other temperatures). The elasticity may be different, even though the hardness is the same. Because Hager et al. only uses SORBOTHANE of different hardness values, the other vibration/shock absorbing characteristics are presumably the same. Thus, Hager et al. fails to disclose that the members are made of mutually different materials, as claimed.

Thus, the 35 USC §102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also maintained from the previous Office Action, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 1-2, 14/1, 14/4, 14/5, 14/6, 15/1, 15/4, 16/1, 16/4, 16/5, 16/6, 17/1, 17/4, 17/5, 17/6, 18 and 19 as unpatentable over Vaughese et al. in view of Genix et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted in Applicants' Appeal Brief, Vaughese et al. discloses a series of hard disk drives anchored to the top sides of perforated metal plates 62 disposed above the top sides of

molded plastic support trays 38 in parallel relationships therewith. Sets of spaced-apart elastomeric cushioning members 70 have upper portions captively retained between each metal plate 62 and its associated plastic tray 38, and lower portions projecting downwardly beyond the tray 38.

Fig. 4 shows cushioning members 70 being attached to plastic tray 38, while metal plate 62 rests on the upper surface of the cushioning members 70.

As admitted by the Examiner, Vaughese et al. fails to disclose any element which corresponds to the insulative sheet member of the present invention, the benefits of such being disclosed on page 24, lines 13-32 of the specification of the instant application.

The Examiner has cited Genix et al. for teaching an "inherently insulative sheet 22" between the disk drive unit 18 and mount 20.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Item 22 is a PC board 22, which contains at least SIMM connectors 26.

Thus, Genix et al. does not teach, mention or suggest a sheet member which has both resilient and insulative properties, as does the sheet member 41 of the instant application, which is constructed of polyester.

Accordingly, claims 1, 4, 18 and 19 have been amended to recite the resilient property of the sheet member, and the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 10-13, 14/10, 14/12, 15/10, 15/12, 16/10, 16/12, 17/10, 17/12, 22-29 and 31/22 have been allowed.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1, 2 and 4-31, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP


William L. Brooks

Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/mla
Atty. Docket No. **981331**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time